arXiv:1411.6421v1 [math.CV] 24 Nov 2014

Directed harmonic currents near hyperbolic singularities

Viêt-Anh Nguyên

November 25, 2014

Abstract

Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a holomorphic foliation by curves defined in a neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{C}^2$ having 0 as a hyperbolic singularity. Let T be a harmonic current directed by $\mathscr{F}$ which does not give mass to any of the two separatrices. Then we show that the Lelong number of T at 0 vanishes. Next, we apply this local result to investigate the global mass-distribution for directed harmonic currents on singular holomorphic foliations living on compact complex surfaces. Finally, we apply this global result to study the recurrence phenomenon of a generic leaf.

Classification AMS 2010: Primary: 37F75, 37A30; Secondary: 57R30.
Keywords: holomorphic foliation, hyperbolic singularity, directed harmonic current, Lelong number.

1 Introduction

While investigating the unique ergodicity of harmonic currents on singular holomorphic foliations in $\mathbb{P}^2$, Fornæss and Sibony in [7, Corollary 2] have established, among other things, the following remarkable result.

Theorem 1.1. (Fornæss-Sibony [7]) *Let $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ be a hyperbolic foliation with the set of singularities E in a compact complex surface M. Assume that all the singularities are hyperbolic and that the foliation has no invariant analytic curve. Then for every harmonic current T directed by $\mathscr{F}$, its transverse measure is diffuse, that is, T gives no mass to each single leaf.*

In fact, the original version of Fornæss-Sibony theorem is only formulated for the case $M = \mathbb{P}^2$. However, their argument still goes through (at least) in the above general context. On the other hand, a convenient way to quantify the density of harmonic currents is to use the notion of Lelong number introduced by Skoda [11]. Indeed, Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to the assertion that the Lelong

number of T vanishes everywhere outside E. Complementarily to this theorem, the main purpose of the present work is to investigate the mass-clustering phenomenon of T near the set of singularities E. Here is our main result which is of local nature.

Theorem 1.2. (Main Theorem). *Let $(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathscr{F}, \{0\})$ be a holomorphic foliation on the unit bidisc $\mathbb{D}^2$ associated to the linear vector field $\Phi(z,w) = \mu z\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \lambda w\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$, where λ, μ are some nonzero complex numbers such that $\lambda/\mu \notin \mathbb{R}$. Then for every harmonic current T directed by $\mathscr{F}$ which does not give mass to any of the two separatrices $(z=0)$ and $(w=0)$, the Lelong number of T at 0 vanishes.*

Note that the hypothesis on the linear vector field means that 0 is an isolated hyperbolic singularity of the foliation (see, for example, the recent survey [6]). In order to prove Theorem 1.2 we are inspired by the approach of Fornæss–Sibony in [6, 7] which is based on integral formulas. Indeed, the nature of the holonomy maps associated to a hyperbolic singularity permits to use Poisson representation formula for harmonic functions on leaves associated to a given harmonic current near the singularity. Therefore, we are led to analyze the behavior of some singular integrals at the infinity, i.e. when the leaves get close to the separatrices. Using delicate estimates on Poisson kernel, we are able to handle these singular integrals.

Combining Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following result which gives a rather complete picture of the mass-distribution of directed harmonic currents in dimension 2.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ be a hyperbolic foliation with the set of singularities E in a compact complex surface M. Assume that all the singularities are hyperbolic and that the foliation has no invariant analytic curve. Then for every harmonic current T directed by $\mathscr{F}$, the Lelong number of T vanishes everywhere in M.*

The above theorem and a result by Glutsyuk [8] and Lins Neto [9] gives us the following corollary. It can be applied to every generic foliation in $\mathbb{P}^2$ with a given degree $d > 1$.

Corollary 1.4. *Let $(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathscr{F}, E)$ be a singular foliation by Riemann surfaces on the complex projective plane $\mathbb{P}^2$. Assume that all the singularities are hyperbolic and that $\mathscr{F}$ has no invariant algebraic curve. Then for every harmonic current T directed by $\mathscr{F}$, the Lelong number of T vanishes everywhere in $\mathbb{P}^2$.*

It is worthy noting that under the hypothesis of Corollary 1.4 there is a unique harmonic current T of mass 1 directed by $\mathscr{F}$. Indeed, this is a consequence of Fornæss-Sibony theorem on the unique ergodicity of harmonic currents (see Theorem 4 in [7]).

As an application of our results we will study the problem of leaf recurrence. This problem asks how often the leaf L_a of a point a, which is generic with respect to a directed harmonic current T, visits the neighborhood of a given point x. Our approach to this question is to apply a geometric Birkhoff ergodic theorem which has recently been obtained in our joint-work with Dinh and Sibony [2]. The theorem permits us to define, using the leafwise Poincaré metric, an indicator which measures the frequency of a generic leaf visiting a small ball near a given point in terms of the radius of the ball. This, combined Theorem 1.3, gives us an upper estimate on the frequency outside and near singularities (see Theorem 5.2 below).

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 below we set up the background of the article. Next, we develop our main estimates in Section 3 which are the core of the work. The proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 will be provided in Section 4. The recurrence phenomenon of a generic leaf will be studied in Section 5. The article is concluded with some remarks and open questions.

2 Background

Let M be a complex surface. A *holomorphic foliation (by Riemann surfaces)* $(M, \mathscr{F})$ on M is the data of a *foliation atlas* with charts

$$\Phi_p : \mathbb{U}_p \to \mathbb{B}_p \times \mathbb{T}_p.$$

Here, $\mathbb{T}_p$ and $\mathbb{B}_p$ are domains in $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{U}_p$ is a domain in M, and Φ_p is biholomorphic, and all the changes of coordinates $\Phi_p \circ \Phi_q^{-1}$ are of the form

$$x = (y, t) \mapsto x' = (y', t'), \quad y' = \Psi(y, t), \quad t' = \Lambda(t).$$

The open set $\mathbb{U}_p$ is called a *flow box* and the Riemann surface $\Phi_p^{-1}\{t = c\}$ in $\mathbb{U}_p$ with $c \in \mathbb{T}_p$ is a *plaque*. The property of the above coordinate changes insures that the plaques in different flow boxes are compatible in the intersection of the boxes. Two plaques are *adjacent* if they have non-empty intersection.

A *leaf* L is a minimal connected subset of M such that if L intersects a plaque, it contains that plaque. So a leaf L is a Riemann surface immersed in M which is a union of plaques. A leaf through a point x of this foliation is often denoted by L_x. A *transversal* is a Riemann surface immersed in X which is transverse to the leaves of $\mathscr{F}$.

A *holomorphic foliation with singularities* is the data $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$, where M is a complex surface, E a closed subset of M and $(M \setminus E, \mathscr{F})$ is a holomorphic foliation. Each point in E is said to be a *singular point,* and E is said to be *the set of singularities* of the foliation. We always assume that $\overline{M \setminus E} = M$, see e.g. [2, 5, 6] for more details. If M is compact, then we say that the foliation $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ is *compact.* A leaf L of the foliation is said to be *hyperbolic* if it is

a hyperbolic Riemann surface, i.e., it is uniformized by the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$. The foliation is said to be *hyperbolic* if its leaves are all hyperbolic.

Consider a holomorphic foliation $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ with a discrete set of singularities E on a complex surface M. We say that a singular point $x \in E$ is *linearizable* if there is a (local) holomorphic coordinates system of M on an open neighborhood $\mathbb{U}_x$ of x on which $(\mathbb{U}_x, x)$ is identified with $(\mathbb{D}^2, 0)$ and the leaves of $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ are, under this identification, integral curves of a linear vector field $\Phi(z, w) = \mu z\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \lambda w\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$ with some nonzero complex numbers λ, μ. Such neighborhood $\mathbb{U}_x$ is called a *singular flow box* of x. Moreover, we say that a linearizable singular point $x \in E$ is *hyperbolic* if $\lambda/\mu \notin \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\mathscr{C}_{\mathscr{F}}$ (resp. $\mathscr{C}^1_{\mathscr{F}}$) denote the space of functions (resp. forms of bidegree $(1,1)$) defined on leaves of the foliations and compactly supported on $M \setminus E$ which are leafwise smooth and transversally continuous. A form $\alpha \in \mathscr{C}^1_{\mathscr{F}}$ is said to be *positive* if its restriction to every plaque is a positive $(1,1)$-form in the usual sense. A *harmonic current T directed by the foliation $\mathscr{F}$* (or equivalently, a *directed harmonic current T on $\mathscr{F}$*) is a linear continuous form on $\mathscr{C}^1_{\mathscr{F}}$ which verifies $i\partial\overline{\partial}T = 0$ in the weak sense (namely $T(i\partial\overline{\partial}f) = 0$ for all $f \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathscr{F}}$), and which is positive (namely, $T(\alpha) \geq 0$ for all positive forms $\alpha \in \mathscr{C}^1_{\mathscr{F}}$).

Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a flow box which admits $\mathbb{T}$ as a transversal. Then a harmonic current T in $\mathbb{U}$ can be decomposed as

$$T = \int_{\alpha\in\mathbb{T}} h_\alpha[P_\alpha]d\nu(\alpha), \tag{1}$$

where, ν is a positive measure on $\mathbb{T}$, and for ν-almost every $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$, P_α is the plaque in $\mathbb{U}$ passing through α and h_α denotes the harmonic function associated to the current T on P_α.

Recall from [11] that the Lelong number of T at a point $x \in M$ is

$$\mathcal{L}(T, x) := \lim_{r\to 0+} \frac{1}{\pi r^2} \int_{B(x,r)} T \wedge i\partial\overline{\partial}\|y\|^2, \tag{2}$$

where we identify, through a biholomorphic change of coordinate, a neighborhood of x in M with an open neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and $B(x, r)$ is thus identified with the Euclidean ball with center 0 and radius r.

3 Main estimates

We keep the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2. Suppose without loss of generality that the foliation $\mathscr{F}$ is defined on the bidisc of radius 2, i.e, $(2\mathbb{D})^2$ in place of $\mathbb{D}^2$ and that the constant $\mu = 1$. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be the foliation in $\mathbb{C}^2$ associated to the vector field $\Phi(z, w) = z\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \lambda w\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$ with some complex number $\lambda = a + ib$, $b \neq 0$. So $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{F}$ on $(2\mathbb{D})^2$. Note that if we flip z and w, we replace λ by

$1/\lambda = \bar{\lambda}/|\lambda|^2 = a/(a^2+b^2) - ib/(a^2+b^2)$. Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that $b > 0$. We now describe a general leaf of $\mathscr{L}$. There are two separatrices, $(w = 0)$, $(z = 0)$. Other than that a leaf L of $\mathscr{L}$ is equal to $L_{(1,\alpha)} =: L_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$. Following [7, Section 2] L_α can be parametrized by

$$(z,w) = \psi_\alpha(\zeta),\ z = e^{i(\zeta+(\log|\alpha|)/b)},\ \zeta = u+iv,\ w = \alpha e^{i\lambda(\zeta+(\log|\alpha|)/b)}, \tag{3}$$

because $\psi_\alpha(-\log|\alpha|/b) = (1,\alpha)$. Setting $t := bu + av$, we have that

$$|z| = e^{-v}, |w| = e^{-bu-av} = e^{-t}. \tag{4}$$

Observe that as we follow z once counterclockwise around the origin, u increases by 2π, so the absolute value of $|w|$ decreases by the multiplicative factor of $e^{-2\pi b}$. Hence, we cover all leaves of $\mathscr{F}|_{\mathbb{D}^2}$ by restricting the values of α so that $e^{-2\pi b} = |\alpha| < 1$. We notice that with the above parametrization, the intersection with the unit bidisc $\mathbb{D}^2$ of the leaf is given by the domain $\{(u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 :\ v > 0, u > -av/b\}$. The main point of this special parametrization is that the above domain is independent of α. In the (u,v)-plane this domain corresponds to a sector S_λ with corner at 0 and given by $0 < \theta < \arctan(-b/a)$ where the arctan is chosen to have values in $(0,\pi)$. Let $\gamma := \frac{\pi}{\arctan(-b/a)}$. It is important to note that $\gamma > 1$. Then the map

$$\phi : \tau = u+iv \mapsto \tau^\gamma = (u+iv)^\gamma =: U+iV \tag{5}$$

maps this sector to the upper half plane with coordinates (U,V).

The local leaf clusters on both separatrices. To investigate the clustering on the z-axis, we use a transversal $\mathbb{T}_{z_0} := \{(z_0,w) : |w| < 1\}$ for some $|z_0| = 1$. We can normalize so that $h_\alpha(z_0,w) = 1$ where (z_0,w) is the point on the local leaf with $e^{-2\pi b} \le |w| < 1$. So $(z_0,w) = \psi_\alpha(\zeta_0) = \psi_\alpha(u_0+iv_0)$ with $v_0 = 0$ and $0 < u_0 \le 2\pi$ determined by the equations $|z_0| = e^{-v_0} = 1$ and $e^{-2\pi b} \le |w| = e^{-bu_0-av_0} < 1$. Let T be a harmonic current of mass 1 directed by $\mathscr{F}$. Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a flow box which admits $\mathbb{T}_{z_0}$ as a transversal. Then by (1) we can write in $\mathbb{U}$

$$T = \int h_\alpha [P_\alpha] d\nu(\alpha), \tag{6}$$

where, for ν-almost every α satisfying $e^{-2\pi b} \le |\alpha| \le 1$, h_α denotes the harmonic function associated to the current T on the plaque P_α which is contained in the leaf L_α. We still denote by h_α its harmonic continuation along L_α. Define $\tilde{h}_\alpha(\zeta) := h_\alpha\left(e^{i(\zeta+(\log|\alpha|)/b)}, \alpha e^{i\lambda(\zeta+(\log|\alpha|)/b)}\right)$ on S_λ. Consider the harmonic function $\tilde{H}_\alpha := \tilde{h}_\alpha \circ \phi^{-1}$ defined in the upper half plane $\{U+iV :\ V > 0\}$, where ϕ is given in (5). Recall the following result from [7].

Lemma 3.1. *The harmonic function $\tilde{H}_\alpha$ is the Poisson integral of its boundary values. So in the upper half plane $\{U+iV :\ V > 0\}$,*

$$\tilde{H}_\alpha(U+iV) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{H}_\alpha(y)\frac{V}{V^2+(y-U)^2}dy$$

for ν-almost every α. Moreover,

$$\int_{e^{-2\pi b}\le|\alpha|\le 1}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\tilde{H}_\alpha(y)(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}dyd\nu(\alpha)<\infty.$$

Proof. The lemma follows from Proposition 1 and Remark 1 in [7]. The finiteness of the integral follows from the finiteness of the total mass of the harmonic currents on the disjoint flow boxes crossed when we follow a path around the two separatrices, but away from the singularity 0. □

For $0<r<1$, let

$$F(r):=\int_{B_r}T\wedge i\partial\overline{\partial}\|x\|^2, \tag{7}$$

where B_r denotes the ball centered at 0 with radius r in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Consider also the function

$$G(r):=\frac{1}{r^2}F(r). \tag{8}$$

By Skoda [11], $G(r)$ decreases as $r\searrow 0$, and $\lim_{r\to 0}G(r)$ is the Lelong number $\mathcal{L}(T,0)$ of T at 0. On the other hand, for each $s>0$ consider two domains

$$D_s^*:=\{(u,v)\in S_\lambda:\min\{v,bu+av\}\ge s\}\text{ and }D_s:=\{(t,v)\in\mathbb{R}^2:\ \min\{t,v\}\ge s\},$$

and the function $K_s:\ \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^+$ given by

$$K_s(y):=\int_{D_s^*}\frac{e^{2s-2\min\{v,bu+av\}}V}{V^2+(y-U)^2}dudv=\frac{1}{b}\int_{D_s}\frac{e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}}V}{V^2+(y-U)^2}dtdv,\qquad y\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{9}$$

Here the last equality holds since $t=bu+av$ by (4).

In what follows the letters c, c', c_1, c_2 etc. denote positive constants, not necessarily the same at each occurrence. For two positive-valued functions A and B, we write $A\approx B$ if there is a constant c such that $c^{-1}A\le B\le cA$.

Lemma 3.2. *There is a constant $c>0$ such that for every $0<r<1$, we have*

$$G(r)\le c\int_{e^{-2\pi b}\le|\alpha|\le 1}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}K_{-\log r}(y)\tilde{H}_\alpha(y)dy\Big)d\nu(\alpha).$$

Proof. Using (6), (7) and the parametrization (3), and the assumption that T does not give mass to any of the two separatrices ($z=0$) and ($w=0$), we have, for $0<r<1$, that

$$F(r)=\int_{e^{-2\pi b}\le|\alpha|\le 1}\int_{\zeta\in S_\lambda:\ \|\psi_\alpha(\zeta)\|\le r}h_\alpha(\psi_\alpha(\zeta))\|\psi'_\alpha(\zeta)\|^2id\zeta\wedge d\bar{\zeta}.$$

On the other hand, we infer from (4) that $\|(z,w)\|=\|\psi_\alpha(\zeta)\|\le r$ implies $\min\{v,bu+av\}\ge-\log r$. Moreover, using (3) and (4) again, we get that

$$\|\psi'_\alpha(\zeta)\|=\sqrt{|z|^2+|\lambda w|^2}\le(1+|\lambda|)e^{-\min\{v,bu+av\}}.$$

Consequently,

$$F(r) \leq c \int_{e^{-2\pi b} \leq |\alpha| \leq 1} \int_{(u,v) \in D^*_{-\log r}} h_\alpha(\psi_\alpha(u+iv)) e^{-2\min\{v, bu+av\}} du dv.$$

Writing $U + iV = (u+iv)^\gamma$ as in (5), an application of Lemma 3.1 yields that

$$h_\alpha(\psi_\alpha(u+iv)) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{H}_\alpha(y) \frac{V}{V^2 + (y-U)^2} dy$$

for ν-almost every α. Inserting this into the last estimate for $F(r)$ and taking (8) into account and writing $r^{-2} = e^{-2\log r}$, the lemma follows. □

The next lemma studies the behavior of the Poisson kernel $\frac{V}{V^2+(y-U)^2}$ in terms of u and v.

Lemma 3.3. *There are constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 1$ large enough with $c_3 > c_2$ such that the following properties hold for all $(u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\min\{v, bu+av\} \geq 1$.*
1)

$$\frac{1}{c_1} \leq \frac{(\max\{v, bu+av\})^\gamma}{\sqrt{V^2+U^2}} \leq c_1 \text{ and } \frac{1}{c_1} \leq \frac{(\max\{v, bu+av\})^{\gamma-1} \min\{v, bu+av\}}{V} \leq c_1.$$

2) If $\max\{v, bu+av\} \geq c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$, then

$$\frac{1}{c_1} \frac{\min\{v, bu+av\}}{(\max\{v, bu+av\})^{\gamma+1}} \leq \frac{V}{V^2+(y-U)^2} \leq c_1 \frac{\min\{v, bu+av\}}{(\max\{v, bu+av\})^{\gamma+1}}.$$

3) If $\max\{v, bu+av\} \leq c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$, then

$$\frac{1}{c_1} \frac{V}{(1+|y|)^2} \leq \frac{V}{V^2+(y-U)^2} \leq c_1 \frac{V}{(1+|y|)^2}.$$

4) If $c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \leq v, bu+av \leq c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$, then

$$\frac{1}{c_1} \frac{1}{(1+|y|)} \leq \frac{V}{V^2+(y-U)^2} \leq c_1 \frac{1}{(1+|y|)}.$$

5) If $\min\{v, bu+av\} \leq c_3^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$ and $c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \leq \max\{v, bu+av\} \leq c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$, then

$$\frac{1}{c_1} \leq \frac{V}{V^2+(y-U)^2} : \frac{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} \min\{v, bu+av\}}{(\min\{v, bu+av\})^2 + (\max\{v, bu+av\} - \rho)^2} \leq c_1,$$

where ρ is a real number which depends only on y and $\min\{v, bu+av\}$, and which satisfies $c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \leq \rho \leq c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$.

Proof. Proof of Part 1). The first inequality of Part 1) follows from the equality $|U+iV| = |u+iv|^\gamma$. To prove the second inequality of Part 1) we use some elementary trigonometric arguments. Let O denote the origin in the (u,v)-plane ane let M denote the point $u+iv$. Recall that the sector S_λ is delimited by two rays emanating from O which correspond to two lines $v=0$ and $bu+av=0$. Let A (resp. B) be the unique point lying on the ray corresponding to $v=0$ (resp. $bu+av=0$) such that $OA=1$ (resp. $OB=1$). Let $\theta := \angle\widehat{AOM}$ and $\vartheta := \angle\widehat{MOB}$. Then $\theta, \vartheta \geq 0$ and $\theta+\vartheta = \arctan(-b/a) \in (0,\pi)$. A geometric argument gives that

$$\sin\theta = v/OM \quad \text{and} \quad \sin\vartheta = (bu+av)/OM.$$

Moreover,

$$\max\{v, bu+av\} \leq OM \leq |u|+|v| \leq (1+(1+|a|)b^{-1})\max\{v, bu+av\}.$$

Consequently,

$$\sin\theta \approx \frac{v}{\max\{v, bu+av\}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sin\vartheta \approx \frac{bu+av}{\max\{v, bu+av\}}. \tag{10}$$

Let N be the point $U+iV$ in the (U,V)-plane. Let C (resp. D) be the image of A (resp. B) by the map $\phi: \ \tau \mapsto \tau^\gamma$ given in (5). Clearly, $\angle\widehat{CON} = \gamma\theta$ and $\angle\widehat{NOD} = \gamma\vartheta$ and $\angle\widehat{CON} + \angle\widehat{NOD} = \gamma\theta+\gamma\vartheta = \pi$. Suppose without loss of generality that $\theta \leq \vartheta$, or equivalently $v \leq bu+av$. Then $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$ and $\angle\widehat{CON} = \gamma\theta \leq \pi/2$. Combining this with the well-known estimate $2/\pi \leq (\sin t)/t \leq 1$ for $0 < t \leq \pi/2$, we get that

$$\sin(\gamma\theta) \approx \gamma\theta \approx \gamma\sin\theta \approx \sin\theta \approx \frac{v}{\max\{v, bu+av\}},$$

where the last estimate holds by (10). On the other hand, a geometric argument shows that

$$V = \sqrt{U^2+V^2}\cdot\sin\angle\widehat{CON} = \sqrt{U^2+V^2}\cdot\sin(\gamma\theta).$$

This, coupled with the last estimate for $\sin(\gamma\theta)$ and the first estimate (for $\sqrt{U^2+V^2}$) in Part 1), implies the second estimate of this part.

Proof of Part 2). We will show that there is a constant $c>1$ such that

$$c^{-1}(U^2+V^2) \leq V^2+(y-U)^2 \leq c(U^2+V^2). \tag{11}$$

Taking (11) for granted, Part 2) follows from combining (11) with Part 1).

Now we turn to the proof of (11). Using the first estimate of Part 1) and the assumption of Part 2), we have that

$$\sqrt{U^2+V^2} \geq c_1^{-1}(\max\{v, bu+av\})^\gamma \geq c_1^{-1}c_2^\gamma(1+|y|). \tag{12}$$

Therefore,

$$V^2 + (y-U)^2 \leq V^2 + 2U^2 + 2y^2 \leq (2 + 2c_1^2 c_2^{-2\gamma})(U^2 + V^2),$$

which proves the right-side estimate of (11) for $c := 2 + 2c_1^2 c_2^{-2\gamma}$.

To prove the left-side estimate of (11), consider two cases. If $V \geq |U|$ then $V^2 + (y-U)^2 \geq V^2 \geq 1/2(U^2+V^2)$. If $V < |U|$ then for $c_2 > 1$ large enough, (12) yields that $|U| \geq 2|y|$, which in turn implies that $V^2 + (y-U)^2 \geq V^2 + 1/4U^2 \geq 1/4(U^2+V^2)$. This completes the proof of (11).

Proof of Part 3). Using the first estimate of Part 1) and the assumption of Part 3), we have that

$$\sqrt{U^2+V^2} \leq c_1(\max\{v, bu+av\})^\gamma \leq c_1 c_2^{-\gamma}(1+|y|).$$

We fix $c_2 > 1$ is large enough so that the last line gives $|y| \geq 2c_1 \cdot \max\{|U|, V\}$. This gives, using the first estimate of Part 1), that

$$|y| \geq c_1\sqrt{U^2+V^2} \geq (\max\{v, bu+av\})^\gamma \geq 1.$$

Consequently, we get, using $|y| > 2|U|$, that

$$1/12(1+|y|)^2 \leq 1/4y^2 \leq V^2 + (y-U)^2 \leq V^2 + 2U^2 + 2y^2 \leq 4(1+|y|)^2,$$

which completes Part 3).

Proof of Part 4). By the assumption of Part 4), $v \approx bu + av$. Consequently, we deduce from (10) that $\theta, \vartheta \approx 1$, which in turn implies that $V, U \approx \sqrt{U^2+V^2}$. This, combined with the assumption of Part 4) and the first estimate of Part 1), yields that

$$V, U, \sqrt{U^2+V^2} \approx 1 + |y|.$$

Using this and the inequalities

$$(1+|y|)^2 \approx V^2 \leq V^2 + (y-U)^2 \leq V^2 + 2U^2 + 2y^2 \approx (1+|y|)^2,$$

Part 4) follows.

Proof of Part 5). Let (u, v) as in the assumption of Part 5) and let $c_1, c_2 > 1$ be constants given by Part 1). Suppose without loss of generality that $v \leq t$, where $t := bu + av$ as usual. Fix $c_3 \geq c_2$ large enough so that for every $1 \leq v \leq c_3^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$, there exist a solution $u := u(y, v)$ of the following equation

$$U = y, \qquad \text{where } U + iV = (u+iv)^\gamma$$

which satisfies

$$c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \leq u(y,v), \rho(y,v) \leq c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma},$$

where $\rho(y,v) := bu(y,v)+av$. Let $\rho = \rho(y,v)$. Note that for $c_3 \geq c_2$ large enough, $u = b^{-1}(\rho - av) \geq 1$. Recall the following elementary fact

$$\gamma|u-u'|(\min\{u,u'\})^{\gamma-1} \leq |u^\gamma - u'^\gamma| \leq \gamma|u-u'|(\max\{u,u'\})^{\gamma-1}, \qquad u,u' > 0.$$

Using the above equation and the above fact, we get, for $c_3 \geq c_2$ large enough, that

$$\begin{aligned} |U-y| \geq c'''|(U+iV)-y| &= |(u+iv)^\gamma - (u(y,v)+iv)^\gamma| \\ &\geq c''|u-u(y,v)|(\min\{u,u(y,v)\})^{\gamma-1} \\ &\geq c'|u-u(y,v)|(1+|y|)^{1-1/\gamma} = c'b|t-\rho(y,v)|(1+|y|)^{1-1/\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < c', c'', c''' < 1$ are some constants. This, combined with the second inequality of Part 1), implies the right hand side estimate of Part 5). □

The following elementary estimate is needed.

Lemma 3.4. *For every $s_0 \geq 1$, $\int_{s_0}^\infty s e^{2s_0-2s} ds = s_0/2 + 1/4$.*

Proof. An integration by parts gives that

$$1/2 = \int_{s_0}^\infty e^{2s_0-2s} ds = [s e^{2s_0-2s}]_{s=s_0}^{s=\infty} + 2\int_{s_0}^\infty s e^{2s_0-2s} ds = 2\int_{s_0}^\infty s e^{2s_0-2s} ds - s_0.$$

□

Now we arrive at the main estimate of this section, i.e, a precise behavior of $K_s(y)$ when the leaves get close to the separatrices.

Proposition 3.5. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $s > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\frac{K_s(y)}{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}} \leq c \min\left\{1, \left[\frac{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}}{s}\right]^{\gamma-1}\right\}.$$

Proof. Let c_2, c_3 be the constants with $c_3 > c_2 > 1$ given by Lemma 3.3. We consider three cases.

Case 1: $s \geq c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$.

By Part 2) of Lemma 3.3 and by formula (9), we have that

$$K_s(y) \leq c\int_{D_s} e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}} \frac{\min\{v,t\}}{(\max\{v,t\})^{\gamma+1}} dtdv \leq c'\Big(\int_{t=s}^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{\gamma+1}}\Big)\Big(\int_{v=s}^\infty v e^{2s-2v} dv\Big).$$

The first integral on the right hand side is equal to $\gamma^{-1}s^{-\gamma}$, while the second one is, by Lemma 3.4, equal to $s/2+1/4$. Hence, $K_s(y) \leq cs^{1-\gamma}$. This completes Case 1.

Case 2: $c_2^{-1} \leq \frac{s}{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}} \leq c_2$.

Write $D_s = D_s^{'} \cup D_s^{''}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_s^{'} &:= \big\{(t,v) \in D_s : \ \max\{t,v\} \le c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}\big\}, \\ D_s^{''} &:= \big\{(t,v) : \ s \le \min\{t,v\} \text{ and } c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \le \max\{t,v\}\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, formula (9) gives that

$$K_s(y) = \frac{1}{b}\Big(\int_{D_s'} + \int_{D_s''}\Big)\frac{e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}}V}{V^2+(y-U)^2}dtdv =: I + II. \tag{13}$$

To estimate (I), we apply Part 4) of Lemma 3.3 and obtain that

$$I \le c\int_{D_s'} e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}}\frac{dtdv}{(1+|y|)}.$$

The integral is bounded by a constant times

$$\Big(\int_{c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}}^{c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}} \frac{dt}{(1+|y|)}\Big)\Big(\int_{v=c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}}^{\infty} e^{2s-2v}dv\Big).$$

The left integral is equal to $(c_2 + c_2^{-1})(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}$, while the right integral is bounded by $1/2$. Hence, $I \le c(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}$.

To estimate (II), we apply Part 2) of Lemma 3.3 and obtain that

$$II \le c\int_{D_s''} e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}}\frac{\min\{t,v\}dtdv}{(\max\{t,v\})^{\gamma+1}}.$$

The integral in the last line is smaller than a constant times

$$\Big(\int_{t=c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t^{\gamma+1}}\Big)\Big(\int_{v=c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}}^{\infty} ve^{2s-2v}dv\Big).$$

The left integral is equal to $\gamma^{-1}c_2^{-\gamma}(1+|y|)^{-1}$, while the right integral is, by Lemma 3.4, equal to $(c_2^{-1}/2)(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} + 1/4$. Hence, $II \le c(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}$.

Inserting the above estimates for (I) and (II) into (13), we obtain the desired estimate for $K_s(y)$ in the second case.

Case 3: $s \le c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$.

Write $D_s = D_s^1 \cup D_s^2 \cup D_s^3$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_s^1 &:= \big\{(t,v) : \ s \le t, v \le c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}\big\}, \\ D_s^2 &:= \big\{(t,v) : \ s \le \min\{t,v\} \text{ and } c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \le \max\{t,v\}\big\}, \\ D_s^3 &:= \big\{(t,v) : \ \max\{s, c_2^{-3}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}\} \le \min\{t,v\} \\ &\qquad \text{and } c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \le \max\{t,v\} \le c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}\big\}, \\ D_s^4 &:= \big\{(t,v) : \ s \le \min\{t,v\} \le c_3^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \\ &\qquad \text{and } c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \le \max\{t,v\} \le c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we get, similarly as in (13), that

$$K_s(y) = \frac{1}{b}\Big(\int_{D_s^1} + \int_{D_s^2} + \int_{D_s^3} + \int_{D_s^4} \Big) \frac{e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}} V}{V^2 + (y-U)^2} dtdv =: I + II + III + IV.$$

To estimate (I) we apply Part 1) and Part 3) of Lemma 3.3. Consequently, we obtain that

$$I \leq c \int_{D_s^1} (\max\{v,t\})^{\gamma-1} \min\{v,t\} e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}} \frac{dtdv}{(1+|y|)^2}.$$

The integral is bounded by a constant times

$$\Big(\int_{t=s}^{c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}} \frac{t^{\gamma-1}dt}{(1+|y|)^2} \Big) \Big(\int_{v=s}^{c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}} v e^{2s-2v} dv \Big).$$

The left integral is bounded by $\gamma^{-1} c_2^{-\gamma} (1+|y|)^{-1}$, while the right integral is, by Lemma 3.4, bounded by $s/2 + 1/4$. Hence, $I \leq cs(1+|y|)^{-1}$.

To estimate (II), we apply Part 2) of Lemma 3.3 and obtain that

$$II \leq c \int_{D_s^2} e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}} \frac{\min\{t,v\} dtdv}{(\max\{t,v\})^{\gamma+1}}.$$

The integral in the last line is smaller than a constant times

$$\Big(\int_{t=c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t^{\gamma+1}} \Big) \Big(\int_{v=s}^{\infty} v e^{2s-2v} dv \Big).$$

The left integral is equal to $\gamma^{-1} c_2^{-\gamma} (1+|y|)^{-1}$, while the right integral is, by Lemma 3.4, equal to $s/2 + 1/4$. Hence, $II \leq cs(1+|y|)^{-1}$.

To estimate (III), we apply Part 4) of Lemma 3.3 and argue as in Case 2. Consequently, we can show that $III \leq c(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma - 1}$.

To estimate (IV), we apply Part 5) of Lemma 3.3 and obtain that

$$IV \leq c \int_{D_s^4} e^{2s-2\min\{v,t\}} \frac{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} \min\{v, bu+av\} dtdv}{(\min\{v, bu+av\})^2 + (\max\{v, bu+av\} - \rho)^2}.$$

We infer from this estimate that

$$IV \leq c \int_{v=s}^{\infty} \Big(\int_{t=c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}}^{c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}} \frac{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} v dt}{v^2 + (t-\rho(y,v))^2} \Big) e^{2s-2v} dv,$$

where $\rho(y,v)$ satisfies $c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \leq \rho(y,v) \leq c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$. The inner integral is bounded by $IV_1 + IV_2$, where

$$IV_1 = \int_{|t-\rho(y,v)|\leq v} \frac{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} v dt}{v^2 + (t-\rho(y,v))^2} \leq \int_{|t-\rho(y,v)|\leq v} \frac{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} dt}{v} \leq c(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1},$$

and

$$IV_2 \leq \int \frac{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} v dt}{v^2+(t-\rho(y,v))^2} \leq \int \frac{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} v dt}{(t-\rho(y,v))^2} \leq c(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}.$$

Here the integrals in the last line are taken over the region

$$\left\{t \in \mathbb{R}:\ c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \leq t \leq c_2(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma} \text{ and } |t-\rho(y,v)| \geq v\right\}.$$

So the inner integral $\leq c(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}$. Hence, $IV \leq c(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}$.

Combining the estimates for (I), (II), (III) and (IV), and using the assumption $s \leq c_2^{-1}(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma}$, we infer that

$$K_s(y) = I + II + III + IV \leq c's(1+|y|)^{-1} + c'(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} \leq c(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}.$$

The proof of Case 3, and hence the proposition, is thereby completed. □

4 Proofs of the main results

End of the proof of Theorem 1.2.

By Proposition 3.5 the family of functions $(g_s)_{s>0}:\ \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, where g_s is given by

$$g_s(y) := \frac{K_s(y)}{(1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1}}, \qquad y \in \mathbb{R}$$

is uniformly bounded. Moreover, $\lim_{s\to\infty} g_s(y) = 0$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

On the other hand, consider the measure χ on $\mathbb{R}$, given by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi d\chi = \int_{e^{-2\pi b} \leq |\alpha| \leq 1} \Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(y) \tilde{H}_\alpha(y) (1+|y|)^{1/\gamma-1} dy \Big) d\nu(\alpha)$$

for every continuous bounded test function φ on $\mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 3.1, χ is a finite positive measure. Consequently, we get, by dominated convergence, that $\lim_{s\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g_s d\chi = 0$. This, combined with Lemma 3.2, implies that

$$0 \leq \lim_{r\to 0+} G(r) \leq c \cdot \lim_{s\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g_s d\chi = 0,$$

which, coupled with (7)-(8), gives that $\mathcal{L}(T,0) = 0$, as desired. □

End of the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Let $x \in M$ be a point. Consider two cases.

Case 1: $x \notin E$.

Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a regular flow box with transversal $\mathbb{T}$ which contains x. By (1) we can write in $\mathbb{U}$

$$T = \int h_\alpha [V_\alpha] d\nu(\alpha),$$

where, for ν-almost every $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$, h_α denote the positive harmonic function associated to the current T on the plaque V_α. By Harnack inequality, there is a constant $c > 0$ independent of α such that

$$c^{-1}h_\alpha(z) \leq h_\alpha(w) \leq ch_\alpha(z), \qquad z, w \in V_\alpha.$$

Using this and the above local description of T on $\mathbb{U}$ and formula (2), we infer easily that $\mathcal{L}(T, x) \leq c\nu(\{x\})$. On the other hand, by Theorem 1.1, $\nu(\{x\}) = 0$. Consequently, $\mathcal{L}(T, x) = 0$.

Case 2: $x \in E$.

Fix a (local) holomorphic coordinates system of M on a singular flow box $\mathbb{U}_x$ of x such that $(\mathbb{U}_x, x)$ is identified with $(\mathbb{D}^2, 0)$ and the leaves of $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ are integral curves of the linear vector field $\Phi(z, w) = \mu z\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \lambda w\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$ with some nonzero complex numbers λ, μ such that $\lambda/\mu \notin \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that T gives no mass to each single leaf. In particular, T does not give mass to any of the two separatrices $(z = 0)$ and $(w = 0)$. Consequently, we are able to apply Theorem 1.2. Hence, $\mathcal{L}(T, x) = 0$. □

5 Application: recurrence of generic leaves

Let $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ be a hyperbolic foliation with the set of singularities E in a Hermitian compact complex surface (M, ω). Let dist be the distance on M induced by the Hermitian metric. Assume that all the singularities are hyperbolic and that the foliation has no invariant analytic curve. Let T be a nonzero directed harmonic current on $(X, \mathscr{L}, E)$. The existence of such a current has been established by Berndtsson-Sibony in [1, Theorem 1.4], and Fornæss-Sibony in [6, Corollary 3]. Assume in addition that T is extremal (in the convex set of all directed harmonic currents). Let ω_P be the Poincaré metric on $\mathbb{D}$, given by

$$\omega_P(\zeta) := \frac{2}{(1 - |\zeta|^2)^2} id\zeta \wedge d\overline{\zeta}, \qquad \zeta \in \mathbb{D}.$$

For any point $a \in M \setminus E$ consider a universal covering map $\phi_a : \mathbb{D} \to L_a$ such that $\phi_a(0) = a$. This map is uniquely defined by a up to a rotation on $\mathbb{D}$. Then, by pushing forward the Poincaré metric ω_P on $\mathbb{D}$ via ϕ_a, we obtain the so-called *Poincaré metric* on L_a which depends only on the leaf. The latter metric is given by a positive $(1, 1)$-form on L_a that we also denote by ω_P for the sake of simplicity. Since the measure $m_P := T \wedge \omega_P$ is, by [2], of finite mass, we may assume without loss of generality that m_P is a probability measure. So, m_P is a harmonic measure on X with respect to ω_P.

In this section we are interested to the following problem: Given a point $x \in M$ and a m_P-generic point $a \in M \setminus E$, how often the leaf L_a visits the ball $B(x, r)$ as $r \searrow 0$. Here $B(x, r)$ (resp. $\overline{B}(x, r)$) denotes the open (resp. closed)

ball with center x and radius r with respect to the metric dist. The purpose of this section is to apply Theorem 1.3 in order to obtain a partial answer to this question.

Let us introduce some more notation and terminology. Denote by $r\mathbb{D}$ the disc of center 0 and of radius r with $0 < r < 1$. In the Poincaré disc $(\mathbb{D}, \omega_P)$, $r\mathbb{D}$ is also the disc of center 0 and of radius

$$R := \log \frac{1+r}{1-r}\cdot$$

So, we will also denote by $\mathbb{D}_R$ this disc and by $\partial\mathbb{D}_R$ its boundary.

Together with Dinh and Sibony, we introduce the following indicator.

Definition 5.1. For each $r > 0$, the *visibility of a point $a \in M \setminus E$ within distance r from a point $x \in M$* is the number

$$N(a, x, r) = \limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{1}{R} \int_0^R \Big(\int_{\theta=0}^1 \mathbf{1}_{B(x,r)}\big(\phi_a(s_t e^{2\pi i\theta})\big) d\theta \Big) dt \in [0, 1],$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{B(x,r)}$ is the characteristic function associated to the set $B(x, r)$, and s_t is defined by the relation $t = \log \frac{1+s_t}{1-s_t}\cdot$, that is, $s_t\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_t$.

Geometrically, $N(a, x, r)$ is the average, as $R \to \infty$, over the hyperbolic time $0 \le t \le R$, of the Lebesgue measure of the set $\{\theta \in [0, 1] :\ \phi_a(s_t e^{2\pi i\theta}) \in B(x, r)\}$. The last quantity may be interpreted as the portion which hits $B(x, r)$ of the Poincaré circle of radius t with center a spanned on the leaf L_a.

We will see in Lemma 5.4 that the lim sup in Definition 5.1 above can be replaced by a true limit for m_P-almost every $a \in M \setminus E$. Moreover, Definition 5.1 can also be applied to singular holomorphic foliations (by hyperbolic Riemann surfaces) in arbitrary dimensions.

Now we are in the position to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.2. *We keep the above hypothesis and notation. Then for m_P-almost every point $a \in M \setminus E$ and for every point $x \in M$, we have that*

$$N(a, x, r) = \begin{cases} o(r^2), & x \in M \setminus E; \\ o(|\log r|^{-1}), & x \in E. \end{cases}$$

For the proof of this theorem we need some more preparatory results. For all $0 < R < \infty$, consider the following measure on M:

$$m_{a,R} := \frac{1}{M_R}(\phi_a)_*\big((\log \frac{1}{|\zeta|}\omega_P)|_{\mathbb{D}_R}\big).$$

where ω_P denotes also the Poincaré metric on $\mathbb{D}$ and

$$M_R := \int_{\mathbb{D}_R} \log \frac{1}{|\zeta|}\omega_P = \int_{\zeta\in\mathbb{D}_R} \log \frac{1}{|\zeta|} \frac{2}{(1-|\zeta|^2)^2} i d\zeta \wedge d\overline{\zeta}.$$

So, $m_{a,R}$ is a probability measure which depends on a, R but does not depend on the choice of ϕ_a. Recall the following geometric Birkhoff ergodic theorem.

Theorem 5.3. (Dinh-Nguyen-Sibony [2]) *Under the above hypothesis and notation, then for almost every point $a \in X$ with respect to the measure m_P, the measure $m_{a,R}$ defined above converges to m_P when $R \to \infty$.*

The above theorem gives the following connection between $N(a, x, r)$ and m_P.

Lemma 5.4. *For m_P-almost every $a \in M \setminus E$ and for all $x \in M$, the* lim sup *in Definition 5.1 is in fact a true limit. Moreover, if $m_P(\partial B(x, r)) = 0$, then*

$$N(a, x, r) = \lim_{R\to\infty} m_{a,R}(B(x, r)) = m_P(B(x, r)).$$

Notice that there is a value $r_0 > 0$ small enough such that for every $x \in M$, there are at most countable values r with $0 < r < r_0$ such that $m_P(\partial B(x, r)) \neq 0$.

Proof. Let l_R be the length in the Poincaré metric of the circle $\partial\mathbb{D}_R$. For a continuous test function φ on M, Clearly, we have that

$$\frac{1}{R}\int_0^R \Big(\int_{\theta=0}^1 \varphi\big(\phi_a(s_t e^{2\pi i\theta})\big)d\theta\Big)dt = \frac{1}{R}\int_0^R \Big(\int_{(\phi_a)_*[\partial\mathbb{D}_t]} \frac{\varphi \cdot d\sqrt{\omega_P}}{l_t}\Big)dt,$$

where $d\sqrt{\omega_P}$ is the length element associated to the metric ω_P. Moreover, using the polar coordinates, we get that

$$\Big|\frac{1}{R}\int_0^R \Big(\int_{(\phi_a)_*[\partial\mathbb{D}_t]} \frac{\varphi \cdot d\sqrt{\omega_P}}{l_t}\Big)dt - \int \varphi \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi R}(\phi_a)_*\big((\log\frac{1}{|\zeta|}\omega_P)|_{\mathbb{D}_R}\big)\Big|$$
$$\leq \frac{\|\varphi\|_\infty}{R}\int_{t=0}^R |l_t(2\pi)^{-1}\log(1/s_t) - 1|dt.$$

Since $|l_t(2\pi)^{-1}\log(1/s_t) - 1| \approx e^{-t}$, the right hand side tends to 0 as $R \to \infty$.

Next, a direct computation shows that $|M_R - 2\pi R|$ is bounded by a constant. Consequently,

$$\int \varphi \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi R}(\phi_a)_*\big((\log\frac{1}{|\zeta|}\omega_P)|_{\mathbb{D}_R}\big) - \int_M \varphi m_{a,R}$$

tends to 0 as $R \to \infty$. On the other hand, we infer from Theorem 5.3 that $\lim_{R\to\infty}\int\varphi m_{a,R} = \int\varphi m_P$ for m_P-almost every $a \in M \setminus E$. Putting these estimates altogether, we obtain that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\frac{1}{R}\int_0^R \Big(\int_{\theta=0}^1 \varphi\big(\phi_a(s_t e^{2\pi i\theta})\big)d\theta\Big)dt = \int_M \varphi m_P.$$

Writing $\mathbf{1}_{B(x,r)}$ (resp. $\mathbf{1}_{\overline{B}(x,r)}$) as the limit of an increasing (resp. decreasing) sequence of continuous test functions φ and using that $m_P(\partial B(x,r)) = 0$, the lemma follows from the last equality. □

For simplicity we still denote by ω the Hermitian metric on leaves of the foliation $(M \setminus E, \mathscr{F})$ induced by the ambient Hermitian metric ω. Consider the function $\eta : M \setminus E \to [0, \infty]$ defined by

$$\eta(x) := \sup \{ \|D\phi(0)\| : \phi : \mathbb{D} \to L_x \text{ holomorphic such that } \phi(0) = x \}.$$

Here, for the norm of the differential $D\phi$ we use the Poincaré metric on $\mathbb{D}$ and the Hermitian metric ω on L_x. We obtain the following relation between ω and the Poincaré metric ω_P on leaves

$$\omega = \eta^2 \omega_P. \tag{14}$$

We record here the following precise estimate on the function η.

Lemma 5.5. *We keep the above hypotheses and notation. Then there exists a constant $c > 1$ such that $\eta \leq c$ on M, $\eta \geq c^{-1}$ outside the singular flow boxes $\cup_{x \in E} \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{U}_x$ and*

$$c^{-1} s \log^\star s \leq \eta(x) \leq c s \log^\star s$$

for $x \in M \setminus E$ and $s := \operatorname{dist}(x, E)$. Here $\log^\star(\cdot) := 1 + |\log(\cdot)|$ is a log-type function, and $\frac{1}{4}\mathbb{U}_x := (1/4\mathbb{D})^2$ for $\mathbb{U}_x = \mathbb{D}^2$.

Proof. Since there exists no holomorphic non-constant map $\mathbb{C} \to M$ such that out of E the image of $\mathbb{C}$ is locally contained in leaves, it follows from [6, Theorem 15] that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $\eta(x) \leq c$ for all $x \in M \setminus E$. In other words, the foliation is *Brody hyperbolic* following the terminology of our joint-work with Dinh and Sibony [4]. Therefore, the lemma is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.3 in [4]. □

Now we arrive at the

End of the proof of Theorem 5.2.

Let $x \in M$ be a point. Consider two cases.

Case 1: $x \notin E$.

Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a regular flow box with transversal $\mathbb{T}$ which contains x. By (1) we can write in $\mathbb{U}$

$$T = \int h_\alpha [P_\alpha] d\nu(\alpha),$$

where, for ν-almost every $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$, h_α denote the positive harmonic function associated to the current T on the plaque P_α. On the other hand, since $\mathbb{U}$ is away from the set of singularities E, we deduce from Lemma 5.5 that $c^{-1} \leq \eta(y) \leq c$

for $y \in \mathbb{U}$. Using this and (14) and the above expression for T, we infer easily that

$$m_P(y) = (T \wedge \omega_P)(y) = \eta(y)(T \wedge \omega)(y) \approx (T \wedge \omega)(y) \approx T \wedge i\partial\overline{\partial}\|y\|^2, \qquad y \in \mathbb{U}.$$

This, combined with formula (2), implies that

$$\lim_{r\to 0} r^{-2} m_P(B(x,r)) \leq \lim_{r\to 0} cr^{-2} \int_{B(x,r)} T \wedge i\partial\overline{\partial}\|y\|^2 = c\mathcal{L}(T,x).$$

By Theorem 1.1, $\mathcal{L}(T,x) = 0$. On the other hand, we know from Lemma 5.4 that

$$\lim_{r\to 0} r^{-2} N(a,x,r) = \lim_{r\to 0} r^{-2} m_P(B(x,r))$$

for m_P-almost every $a \in M \setminus E$. Putting the last three estimates together, we obtain that $N(a,x,r) = o(r^2)$.

Case 2: $x \in E$.

Fix a (local) holomorphic coordinates system of M on a singular flow box $\mathbb{U}_x$ of x such that $(\mathbb{U}_x, x)$ is identified with $(\mathbb{D}^2, 0)$ and the leaves of $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ are integral curves of the linear vector field $\Phi(z,w) = \mu z\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \lambda w\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$ with some nonzero complex numbers λ, μ such that $\lambda/\mu \notin \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose without loss of generality that the metric ω coincides with the standard metric $i\partial\overline{\partial}\|y\|^2$ on $\mathbb{D}^2$. Next, recall from (14) that

$$i\partial\overline{\partial}\|y\|^2 = \eta^2(y) g_P(y) \approx \|y\|^2(\log\|y\|)^2 g_P(y) \quad \text{for } 0 < \|y\| < 1/2.$$

where the estimate $\approx$ holds by Lemma 5.5. Therefore, we infer that

$$m_P(y) := (T \wedge \omega_P)(y) \approx \frac{T \wedge i\partial\overline{\partial}\|y\|^2}{\|y\|^2(\log\|y\|)^2} \quad \text{on } B_{1/2}.$$

Consequently, for $0 < r < 1/2$,

$$\int_{B_r} m_P(y) \approx \int_{B_r} \frac{T \wedge i\partial\overline{\partial}\|y\|^2}{\|y\|^2(\log\|y\|)^2} = \int_0^r \frac{F'(s)ds}{s^2(\log s)^2},$$

where the last equality follows from (7). So Case 2 will follow if we can show that $\int_0^r \frac{F'(s)ds}{s^2(\log s)^2} = o(|\log r|^{-1})$ as $r \to 0$. Since we know from (7)-(8) that $(s^2G(s))' = F'(s)$, performing an integration by part to the last expression yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^r \frac{F'(s)ds}{s^2(\log s)^2} &= \int_0^r \frac{d(s^2G(s))}{s^2(\log s)^2} \\ &= \left[\frac{G(s)}{(\log s)^2}\right]_0^r + 2\int_0^r \frac{G(s)ds}{s(\log s)^2} + 2\int_0^r \frac{G(s)ds}{s(\log s)^3}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we know from (7)-(8) that $G(r)$ decreases, as $r \searrow 0$, to $\mathcal{L}(T, x)$, which is equal to 0 by Theorem 1.3. Therefore, a straightforward computation shows that all three terms on the right hand side of the last line is of order $o(|\log r|^{-1})$ as $r \to 0$, as desired. This completes the proof of Case 2, and hence the theorem is proved. □

Remark 5.6. We conclude the article with some remarks and open questions.
1) It seems to be of interest to investigate the Main Theorem in the case where the singularity 0 is only linearizable (see [2]).
2) A natural question arises whether the main results of this article can be generalized in higher dimensions. We postpone this issue to a forthcoming work.
3) Now let $(M, \mathscr{F}, E)$ be a hyperbolic foliation with the set of singularities E in a Hermitian compact complex manifold (M, ω) of arbitrary dimension. Assume that all the singularities are linearizable. Using the finiteness of the Lelong number of a positive harmonic current [11], and applying [2] and arguing as in the end of the proof of Theorem 5.2, we can show the following weak form of this theorem (but in higher dimension). For m_P-almost every point $a \in M \setminus E$ and for every point $x \in M$, we have that

$$N(a, x, r) = \begin{cases} O(r^2), & x \in M \setminus E; \\ O(|\log r|^{-1}), & x \in E. \end{cases}$$

References

[1] Berndtsson, Bo; Sibony, Nessim. The $\overline{\partial}$-equation on a positive current. *Invent. Math.* **147** (2002), no. 2, 371-428.

[2] Dinh, T.-C.; Nguyên, V.-A.; Sibony, N. Heat equation and ergodic theorems for Riemann surface laminations. *Math. Ann.* **354**, (2012), no. 1, 331-376.

[3] Dinh, T.-C.; Nguyên, V.-A.; Sibony, N. Entropy for hyperbolic Riemann surface laminations I. *Frontiers in Complex Dynamics: a volume in honor of John Milnor's 80th birthday,* (A. Bonifant, M. Lyubich, S. Sutherland, editors), (2012), Princeton University Press, 24 pages.

[4] Dinh, T.-C.; Nguyên, V.-A.; Sibony, N. Entropy for hyperbolic Riemann surface laminations II. *Frontiers in Complex Dynamics: a volume in honor of John Milnor's 80th birthday,* (A. Bonifant, M. Lyubich, S. Sutherland, editors), (2012), Princeton University Press, 29 pages.

[5] Fornæss, John Erik; Sibony, Nessim. Harmonic currents of finite energy and laminations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **15** (2005), no. 5, 962-1003.

[6] Fornæss, John Erik; Sibony, Nessim. Riemann surface laminations with singularities. *J. Geom. Anal.*, **18** (2008), no. 2, 400-442.

[7] Fornæss, John Erik; Sibony, Nessim. Unique ergodicity of harmonic currents on singular foliations of $\mathbb{P}^2$. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **19** (2010), no. 5, 1334-1377.

[8] Glutsyuk, A.A. Hyperbolicity of the leaves of a generic one-dimensional holomorphic foliation on a nonsingular projective algebraic variety. (Russian) *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, **213** (1997), Differ. Uravn. s Veshchestv. i Kompleks. Vrem., 90-111; translation in *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* 1996, no. 2, **213**, 83-103.

[9] Lins Neto A. Uniformization and the Poincaré metric on the leaves of a foliation by curves. *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.),* **31** (2000), no. 3, 351-366.

[10] Lins Neto, A.; Soares M. G. Algebraic solutions of one-dimensional foliations. *J. Differential Geom.,* **43** (1996), no. 3, 652-673.

[11] Skoda, Henri. Prolongement des courants, positifs, fermés de masse finie. (French) [Extension of closed, positive currents of finite mass] *Invent. Math.* **66** (1982), no. 3, 361376.

Viêt-Anh Nguyên, Mathématique-Bâtiment 425, UMR 8628, Université Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay, France.
`VietAnh.Nguyen@math.u-psud.fr`, `http://www.math.u-psud.fr/~vietanh`